

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-26529-2019

Date of decision: 26.06.2019

Vikram Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Ravinder Phogat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

This is 2nd petition for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.311 dated 17.08.2018 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC, registered at Police Station City Dadri, District Charkhi Dadri.

First petition for grant of anticipatory bail i.e. CRM-M-39821-2018 was dismissed as withdrawn on 24.09.2018, by passing the following order: -

“After arguing for sometime, finding that the Court is not convinced, counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdrawn this petition with liberty to the petitioner to surrender before the trial court and apply for regular bail.

Dismissed as withdrawn with liberty aforesaid. In case, the petitioner surrenders before the trial Court within one week from today and apply for regular bail, his regular bail application be decided within three days.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the new ground for

filing the second petition is that one of the co-accused namely Satish has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

As per allegations in the FIR, the petitioner was recruited in Indian Army by showing his date of birth as 18.01.1998, however, later on, while checking the old record, it came to notice of the army authorities that in an earlier recruitment rally, the petitioner had shown his date of birth as 08.10.1993 and handed over certain documents proving his date of birth as 08.10.1993. It is also stated that in the matriculation certificate, his date of birth is shown as 08.10.1993. The identity of the petitioner was also verified from his medical record. The FIR was registered with the allegations that the petitioner, by manipulating his date of birth, has acquired the job in the Indian Army and has forged the documents.

As noticed above, there are direct allegations against the petitioner and his case is distinguishable with that of the aforesaid co-accused Satish, on the basis of which the second petition for grant of anticipatory bail has been filed.

Since there is no change in the circumstances and the petitioner, after arguing the first petition, had withdrawn the same with liberty to surrender before the trial Court and apply for regular bail, I find no ground to entertain the second petition for grant of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

26.06.2019

vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No